IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

David Morris Clayman (אדם דוד / דוד משה קליימן), Plaintiffs, vs. SCOTT BESSENT, in his official capacity as Secretary of the Treasury; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; CONGRESS; and, DONALD J. TRUMP, in his official capacity as Commander-in-Chief and President of the United States and *Principal Delegating Defendant* and/or *Fallback Delegating Defendant, et. al.*	CASE NO. 9:25-CV-80890-WM **THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT, AS INTERCEPTED AND AS LIGHTLY REVISED**

FILED BY PCS D.C.
JAN 07 2026
ANGELA E. NOBLE
CLERK U.S. DIST. CT.
S.D. OF FLA. – W.P.B.

EXPEDITED HEARING REQUESTED

JUSTICE CAN NOT BE ACHIEVED WITHOUT ORAL FÆR HÆRINGS

PERMISSION REQUEST TO QUICKLY AND IMMEDIATELY SUPERCEDE THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT, ON ATTEMPTED INTERCEPT, AND ALSO FILE INSTANTER

INTERCEPT ATTEMPTED ON THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT

Plaintiff David Morris Clayman respectfully submits this "Third Amended Complaint, Lightly Intercept Revised" in an effort to supercede the stamped filing he dropped off near the close of the Clerk of Court yesterday, which was scanned this morning and may not be on the docket yet. It still wasn't as of 1112 Eastern when this sentence requesting superceding intercept was written.

Last night after case submission I found two minor mistaken hallucinated quotes that slipped into

Claude's final draft after my last (repeated) hallucination check that I failed to catch at the final step and that I need to correct or alert the Court to.

> Those misquotes were in these paragraphs, with the green representing good case citation and the red highlighting the hallucination:
>
> Justice Alito wrote: 'Smith was wrongly decided. As long as it remains on the books, it threatens a fundamental freedom.... Smith's holding is used by government officials and lower courts in every jurisdiction to deny claims for religious exemptions.' He concluded that 'Smith committed a constitutional error' and called on the Court to 'correct that mistake.'
>
> Justice Barrett, joined by Justice Kavanaugh, expressed openness to reconsidering Smith but sought further briefing on what legal standard would replace it. Justice Barrett wrote that she was 'skeptical about swapping Smith's categorical antidiscrimination approach for an equally categorical strict scrutiny regime' and wanted the Court to 'confront these questions before deciding that Smith should be overruled.'

The hallucinations were not pivotal; they were pretty minor and anodyne in meaning, but they were still hallucinations, and I bear a duty to report these noticed hallucinations that slipped in to the Court and rectify them.

They've been rectified in the amended intercept below as:

> Justice Alito wrote: 'Smith was wrongly decided. As long as it remains on the books, it threatens a fundamental freedom. And while precedent should not lightly be cast aside, the Court's error in Smith should now be corrected.' He concluded that 'Smith committed a constitutional error' and called on the Court to correct that mistake immediately.
>
> Justice Barrett, joined by Justice Kavanaugh, expressed openness to reconsidering Smith but sought further briefing on what legal standard would replace it. Justice Barrett wrote that she was 'skeptical about swapping Smith's categorical antidiscrimination approach for an equally categorical strict scrutiny regime' and wanted the Court to confront a set of questions before deciding that Smith should be overruled. Those questions included: "To name a few: Should entities like Catholic Social Services— which is an arm of the

> Catholic Church—be treated differently than individuals? Cf. Hosanna-Tabor Evangelical Lutheran Church and School v. EEOC, 565 U. S. 171 (2012). Should there be a distinction between indirect and direct burdens on religious exercise? Cf. Braunfeld v. Brown, 366 U. S. 599, 606–607 (1961) (plurality opinion). What forms of scrutiny should apply? Compare Sherbert v. Verner, 374 U. S. 398, 403 (1963) (assessing whether government's interest is "'compelling'"), with Gillette v. United States, 401 U. S. 437, 462 (1971) (assessing whether government's interest is "substantial"). And if the answer is strict scrutiny, would pre-Smith cases rejecting free exercise challenges to garden-variety laws come out the same way? See Smith, 494 U. S., at 888–889. "

I've also expanded further on the logic of reincarnation standing, to better fully disclose its boundaries and breadth as a RFRA legal doctrine for those of us who believe in reincarnation. These specified breadths, limits and parameters are specific to HhÅÆJ Judaism — other faith traditions in the faith tree or nayboring faith trees like Buddhhism or Hhinduism may have different reincarnate population parameters and reincarnation depths. Not everyone in Judaism believes in the mystical tradition of reincarnation but I do, for it has tremendously important cosmic justice ramifications for theodicy questions, specifically why bad or even horrible things like cancer happen to good people and why good or wonderful things happen to bad people who do not, by any other available standard in judgment of their actions in this lifetime, seem to merit such treatment or elevation.

I also clarified the distinction between civigion and divigion or branch faith further, I disclosed more calmprehensively to the Court my general sincerely held religious beliefs, and I added reference to an email I sent to the firm of my estate lawyer to set up a fund and estate plan term to protect the legal interests of my reincarnates.

To my knowledge, I did not make any substantive changes to the traditional material of a traditional civil or more classic RFRA lawsuit. Almost all my changes related to better defining

my faith in reincarnation and its unorthodox legal implications in terms of Pro Se representation duty with respect to future generations under a freestanding RFRA claim.

If permission is needed, please allow this intercepting filing to supercede as the **"Third Amended Complaint, As Intercepted And As Lightly Revised"**.

If permission is needed and granted, please ask the Clerk on my behalf to file this Instanter.